

## A Note on the Armenian Dative-Locative Endings *-um*, *-oy*, and *-oj*

WILLIAM R. SCHMALSTIEG  
The Pennsylvania State University

The standard grammars of Indo-European trace the \**o*-stem nominal dative singular ending back to etymological \**-ōi*, chiefly on the basis of Gk. (*lúk*)-*q̄* '(to the) wolf,' etc. Mažiulis, 1970, 106-126, has clearly shown the impossibility of deriving Lith. (*vil̃k*)-*ui* from such an Indo-European prototype. (Actually occurring in Lithuanian, in addition to *-ui*, are the \**o*-stem dative singular endings *-u* [western Dzukish and a part of the neighboring western High Lith. dialects] and *-uo* [reconstructed from Samogitian dialect endings *-ou*, *-ū* and *-ō*]). I would propose that there were originally several dative-locative singular endings in competition, viz. \**-om* (which had a sandhi alternant \**-ō*) and \**-oy*. (See Schmalstieg, 1980, 44-45, 69-70.) These consist, of course, of the stem vowel \**-o-* plus the markers *-y* and *-m* respectively. A contamination of \**-ō* and *-oy* has led to the Gk. ending *-q̄* just as a contamination of Lith. *-u* (< \**-uo* < \**-ō*) and \**-y* (from other stems) have led to the Lith. ending *-ui*, or perhaps the ending is borrowed from the \**u*-stems (Mažiulis, 1970, 117).

The ending dative singular \**-om* is well attested in the northern Indo-European \**o*-stem demonstrative pronouns, cf. Lith. *tam-ui* (with *-ui* a back substitution from the nominal stems), Slavic *tom-u* (with *-u* likewise a back substitution from the nominal stems), Gothic *þamma* (with a doubling of the *-m-*). There is no need to rely exclusively on Indic *tas-mai* here. The substitution of the nom. sg. *tas* as the stem has parallels in Baltic. (One notes, e.g., the Lithuanian dialect definite adjective forms in which the nominative singular serves as a stem from which other cases are derived, cf., acc. sg. masc. *pirmàs-i*, *mėlynàs-j* derived from the indefinite nom. sg. *pirmas* 'first,' *mėlynas* 'blue' [Zinkevičius, 1957, 100].) The retention of the original dative ending \**-om* in the singular in Balto-Slavic has been facilitated by the addition of the nominal (Lith.) *-ui*, (Slavic) *-u*. The older \**-om* was also retained in plural nouns in which the stem \**-o-* and ending *-m* could be

retained because of the addition of a plural suffix, cf., e.g., Lith. (*vilk-*)*ám̃s* (< \*-amus < \*-om-us), Slavic (*vlĭk-*)*omŭ* (< \*-om-us), Gothic (*dag-*)*am* (< \*-om- plus some plural formant). One can compare furthermore the Lith. locative singular pronominal *t-am-è* (< \*-om- plus nominal -e), Slavic *t-om-ĭ* (< \*-om-plus\*-ĭ of obscure origin).

The Armenian dative-locative ending -um can easily be derived from \*-om, and there is no need to presuppose the loss of an \*-s- in a protoform \*-osm- merely on the basis of the evidence of Indic, etc. Baltic, Slavic, and Germanic give good evidence for an etymological \*-om(-). (See Godel, 1975, 35, 109).

One usually writes that Indo-European \**ōi* was shortened to Oscan-Umbrian -oi, retained in Oscan as *Maiúí*, *Hereklúí*, monophthongized to Umbrian -*ē* (*Iuvie* 'Ioviō, to Jupiter'). Since the authenticity of the Praenestine fibula is now to be disputed, this leaves us with the example *populoi Romanoī* in Latin. One encounters *Zextoi Titoi* in Faliscan (Leumann, 1977, 425-426). The Italic examples do not assure us of \**ōi* at all. In view of the evidence then it seems completely unnecessary to derive the Armenian ending -oy from \**ōi* (Djahukyan, G. B., 1978, 165, 168). I would agree with Djahukyan, however, that the -y was retained in word-final position in this form of the ending.

In word-medial preconsonantal position IE \*-y- appears to be represented by Armenian -y-, cf. *taygr* 'brother-in-law, husband's brother', Skt. *devār-*, Gk. *δαῖρ* Lith. *díeveris*; Arm. *ayc* 'goat,' Gk. *αἶξ* gen. *αἰγός* (Meillet, 1936, 50, 44), *gayl* 'wolf,' Old Ir. *fail* 'id.' (Godel, 1975, 82). One can assume then that the retention of the final -y was conditioned originally by its occurrence before a following consonant in sentence sandhi (just as IE \*y was retained in word-medial position before a consonant).

Greppin, 1972, 76-78, writes that there appears to be a bifurcated development of IE initial \*y Armenian, viz., zero or *ǰ*, and he compares this with the bifurcated development in Greek, viz., either initial aspiration or *ζ*. Although suggesting that \*Hy gave Armenian *ǰ* and Gk. *ζ*, he nevertheless is careful to write that this has not yet been positively demonstrated. He gives the following etymologies: *ǰanam* 'I try' (< \*yā-), cf. Gk. *ζῆλος* 'eager rivalry, zeal'; Skt. *yātar-* 'avenger'; Arm. *ǰov* 'sprout,' (< \*yow-), cf. Skt. *yávasa-* 'grass' and (apparently, however, with a different ablaut grade) Gk. *ζειαί* 'spelt'.

Although Greppin disputes the etymology, Arm. *jur* 'water' is commonly compared with Lith. *jūra* 'sea' (Solta, 1963, 100; Meillet, 1936, 52).

Following the consonants *n*, *r*, *l* (and before a vowel) IE *\*-y-* appears as Arm. *j*, cf. *sterj* 'barren, sterile' (< *\*steryo-*), Gk. *steîra*, Lat. *steri-lis* 'id.'; Arm. *oĵ* 'whole, sound' (< *\*olyo*), Old Ir. *uile* 'whole'; Arm. *anurj* 'dream,' (< *\*onōryo-*), Gk. *ὄναρ, ὄνειρος* 'id'. (Meillet, 1936, 52). In addition to these examples, Godel, 1975, 81, suggests some further cases, such as the 1st sg. pres. *mrnmjē* 'I murmur' (beside Gk. *mormūrō*), *płpĵam* 'I bubble' (< *\*pulpuljē*; beside Lat. *bullio*) which presumably reflect *\*-ye-* presents. Cf. also *verj* 'end' which Godel, 81, derives from *uperyo-*.

In all of the examples in the preceding two paragraphs an IE *\*y* has developed to Arm. *j* if followed by a non-front vowel. The only apparent exception is, of course, the development to *j* in verbs of the *\*ye-* conjugation. Here, of course, one must consider the possibility of a generalization on the basis of the paradigmatic *\*yo-* forms (1st sg. and pl. and 3rd pl.).

I propose then that the IE dat.-loc *\*o-* stem ending *\*-oy-* is represented also in Armenian by *-oĵ*. If, in sentence sandhi IE *\*-oy* was followed by a consonant, the Armenian development was to *-oy*. If, on the other hand, IE *\*-oy* was followed by a non-front vowel, then the development was to *-oĵ*. (If there was a following front vowel, the *\*-y* may have been lost completely as in *erek* 'three' [< *\*trēyes*], see Meillet, 1936, 52. This sandhi variant *\*-o* is no longer attested at all.)

According to Tumanian, 1971, 197, locative forms in *-j* are attested for such words as *tari* 'year,' *teli* 'place,' *kłzi* 'island,' *aygi* 'garden, orchard,' etc. The ending is occasionally encountered in the genitive, dative and ablative cases, although, according to Tumanian, it is not characteristic for these. The forms in *-j* are largely specialized for the expression of the locative case, e.g., dat. *tełwoj* or *tełwoĵ*, but loc. *i tełwoĵ* 'in the place,' dat. *aygwoj* or *aygwoĵ*, but loc. *i aygwoĵ* 'in the orchard,' loc. *ikłzwoĵ* 'on the island.' Thus the etymological sandhi variant *-oĵ* tended to be specialized in the locative case, whereas the etymological sandhi variant in *-oy* tended to be specialized in the dative and genitive, although there is some vacillation.

Thus there is a perfectly good explanation for the ending *-oĵ* which has nothing to do with the Greek adverbial *-οῦ* as in

*οὐρανόθεν* (πρό) 'in the heavens' as Meillet, 1936, 73, proposed. In sum, the Armenian dat.-loc. endings -oy and -oŷ both reflect IE \*l-loy and the Armenian dat.-loc. ending -um reflects IE \*-om(-).

## References

- Djahukyan, G. B. 1978. *Obščee i armjanskoe jazykoznanie*. Erevan, AN Armjanskoj SSR.
- Godel, Robert. 1975. *An introduction to the study of classical Armenian*. Wiesbaden, Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.
- Greppin, John A. C. 1972. *The Armenian reflexes of IE \*w and \*y*. *Revue des études arméniennes* 9.69-78.
- Leumann, Manu. 1977. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. Munich, C. H. Beck.
- Mažiulis, V. 1970. *Baltų ir kitų indoeuropiečių kalbų santykiai*. Vilnius, Mintis.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1936. *Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique*. 2nd ed. Vienna, Imprimerie des PP. Mekhitharistes.
- Schmalstieg, William R. 1980. *Indo-European Linguistics: A New Synthesis*. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Solta, G. R. 1963. *Die Armenische Sprache*. Pp. 80-128 in *Armenisch und kaukasische Sprachen*, ed. by B. Spuler. Leiden/Cologne, E. J. Brill.
- Tumanian, E. G. 1971. *Drevnearmjanskij jazyk*. Moscow, Nauka.
- Zinkevičius, Z. 1957. *Lietuvių kalbos įvardžiutinių būdvardžių istorijos bruožai*. Vilnius, Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.